



Department of Social and Health Services Children's Administration Child Fatality Review

April 26-27, 2012 and June 8, 2012

Charles Powell

DOB: 01-2005

Braden Powell

DOB: 01-2007

Committee Members

Richard Anderson, Deputy Prosecutor, King County
Brett Ballew, Managing Attorney, Office of Public Defense
Randi Becker, Senator (R), 2nd Legislative District
Jim Doerty, Judge, King County Superior Court
Jake Fawcett, Fatality Review Coordinator, Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Brad Graham, Detective, Tacoma Police Department, Criminal Investigations Division
Natalie Green, Region 2 Deputy Regional Administrator, Children's Administration
Barbara James, Executive Director, Washington State Court Appointed Special Advocate
Jim Kastama, Senator (D), 25th Legislative District
Kevin Krueger, Chief Risk Officer, Department of Social and Health Services
Mary Meinig, Director, Office of Family and Children's Ombudsman
Dr. Richard Packard, Licensed Psychologist and Certified Sex Offender Treatment Provider

Consultants

Denise Revels Robinson, Assistant Secretary, Children's Administration
Sheila Huber, Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General
Thomas Shapley, Senior Director of Public Affairs, Department of Social and Health Services
Sharon Gilbert, Deputy Director Field Operations, Children's Administration
Nancy Sutton, Region 3 Regional Administrator, Children's Administration

Facilitators

Erwin McEwen, Senior Strategic Consultant, Casey Family Programs
Marilee Roberts, Practice Consultant, Children's Administration

Observers

Jennifer Sullivan, Reporter, Seattle Times

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3-4
Case Overview	4-6
Committee Discussion	6-9
Committee Findings and Recommendations	10-11
Appendix A	12-13

Executive Summary

On April 26-27, 2012 and June 8, 2012, the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), Children's Administration convened a Child Fatality Review¹ referencing a case involving the deaths of 7-year-old, Charles "Charlie" Powell (DOB: 01-2005) and his 5-year-old brother, Braden Powell (DOB: 01-2007) on February 5, 2012. Charlie and Braden were dependents of the state of Washington and in a relative foster care placement with their maternal grandparents at the time of their deaths. Charlie and Braden were on a supervised visit with their father, Joshua Powell,² in the father's home when he killed them and then himself in a planned house fire. The Child Fatality Review Committee reviewed case documents and interviewed Children's Administration staff and law enforcement officials involved in the case to examine the child welfare practices, system collaboration, and service delivery to the children and their family.

On February 5, 2012 at 12:20 p.m. Children's Administration Central Intake received a call from an unidentified person³ reporting she believed Joshua Powell had killed his children. The caller stated, *"This is an emergency. You need to get a hold of [social worker's first name]. I think Josh Powell killed his kids."* The intake worker contacted Pierce County 911 and provided the information received from the referrer. At approximately 1:00 p.m. on this same date multiple media sources reported that Joshua Powell had killed his children and himself in a house fire.

On February 5, 2012 Charlie and Braden were transported to their father's home by a Children's Administration's contracted visitation supervisor for a planned 3-hour court ordered supervised visit with their father. Upon arrival at the home the visitation supervisor stated the boys ran to their father who quickly shut the front door, preventing her from entering the home. Attempts were made by the visitation supervisor to gain Mr. Powell's attention by knocking on the door to get entry into the home, however he did not respond. Preliminary reports⁴ from law enforcement indicate while the visitation supervisor attempted to gain access to the home Mr. Powell hit his children with a hatchet before setting the home on fire with gasoline, killing the children and himself. The Pierce County Medical Examiner determined Charlie's and Braden's cause of death was *carbon monoxide poisoning*; manner: *homicide*.

The family's Children's Administration history began in March 2010 and includes four screened out intakes⁵ between March 2010 and June 2011. In September 2011 Children's Administration

¹ Given its limited purpose, a Child Fatality Review should not be construed to be a final or comprehensive review of all of the circumstances surrounding the death of a child. The Child Fatality Review Committee's review is generally limited to documents in the possession of or obtained by DSHS or its contracted service providers. The Committee has no subpoena power or authority to compel attendance and generally only hears from DSHS employees and service providers. It does not hear the points of view of the child's parents and relatives, or of other individuals associated with the deceased child's life or death. A Child Fatality Review is not intended to be a fact-finding or forensic inquiry or to replace or supersede investigations by courts, law enforcement agencies, medical examiners or other entities with legal responsibility to investigate or review some or all of the circumstances of a child's death. Nor is it the function or purpose of a Child Fatality Review to recommend personnel action against DSHS employees or other individuals.

² The full names of Joshua Powell and the children are being used in this report as their names are linked to a number of public documents regarding the disappearance of Susan Powell in December 2009 and to the investigation into the deaths of the children.

³ The identity of the person was learned at a later date and the intake was amended to reflect the name of the referrer.

⁴ Law enforcement has not yet concluded their investigation and the case remains open at the time of this report.

⁵ An "intake" is a report received by Children's Administration in which a person or persons have reasonable cause to believe or suspect that a child has been abused or neglected. A decision to screen out an intake is based on the absence of allegations of child abuse or neglect as defined by Washington Administrative Code 388-15-009.

received an intake alleging negligent treatment of Charlie and Braden. The call from the Pierce County Sheriff's office reported the children were being placed in protective custody based on information that had been obtained during a search of the family home in August 2011 and resulted in the arrest of the children's paternal grandfather on child pornography and voyeurism charges. The children were placed in licensed foster care for six days; Children's Administration later placed the children with their maternal grandparents. At the time of their deaths the children were in the care and custody of Children's Administration and had court ordered supervised visitation with their father twice weekly. One of the two visits occurred in the father's home, the other occurred in the home of family friends. Discretion regarding location, duration and supervision of the visits was given to Children's Administration by the juvenile court judge overseeing the case.

Following a review of the family's history, case records and discussion, the Committee made findings and recommendations that are detailed at the end of this report.

Case Overview

In January 2010, Joshua Powell and his two young boys moved from West Valley City, Utah, to Mr. Powell's father's home in Puyallup, Washington. The family move followed the suspicious disappearance of Susan Powell, Joshua Powell's wife and the children's mother. Mr. Powell was considered "a person of interest" in the disappearance (and possible murder) of Susan Powell by West Valley City law enforcement.

The family history with Children's Administration began in March 2010 and includes four intake reports made prior to September 2011. The intakes received between March 2010 and June 2011⁶ reported concerns about statements made by Charlie at school in light of news reports in the media regarding the disappearance of the children's mother in December 2009. The referrers called child protective services to report Charlie's statements given their knowledge about his mother's disappearance. The information provided by the referrers did not screen in for a child protective services investigation or further action by Children's Administration because the information provided did not raise allegations that met the definition of child abuse or neglect as defined in Washington Administrative Code 388-15-009. All intakes received by Children's Administration regarding the Powell family were forwarded to law enforcement for their review.

In September 2011 Pierce County Sheriff's Office contacted Children's Administration stating they were placing Charlie and Braden into protective custody and requesting assistance at the home where the children were living with their father and other relatives, including the children's paternal grandfather. Law enforcement stated they were at the home serving an arrest warrant on the children's paternal grandfather on charges related to child pornography and voyeurism. Law enforcement officials further reported that although it did not appear the children had been exposed to any child pornography at the time, they had yet to examine all the information on the computers seized during the August 2011 search of the home to determine if Joshua Powell was involved in the child pornography. At the request of West Valley City, Utah, police, Pierce County law enforcement did not provide information to Department of Social and Health Services - Children's Administration staff regarding the Utah investigation into the

⁶ Intakes received: March 1, 2010, August 20, 2010, February 18, 2011 and June 10, 2011.

disappearance of Susan Powell. The case was assigned for a child protective services investigation based on the allegations of child neglect by their father.

Charlie and Braden were initially placed in foster care, however following an initial shelter care hearing on September 27, 2011, the children were placed in the home of their maternal grandparents. A contested shelter care hearing was held the following day on September 28, 2011 and an order was entered requiring Charlie and Braden to remain in foster care (with the maternal grandparents), requiring supervised visits between the children and their father every Sunday for three hours, and requiring Mr. Powell to obtain a psychological evaluation.

Initial visits between Mr. Powell and his sons began within three days of the children's placement and were supervised by Children's Administration. Following the shelter care hearings, supervision of the visits was provided by Foster Care Resource Network, an agency contracted with Children's Administration to provide supervised visitation. Visits occurred weekly for three hours initially at the offices of Children's Administration, however moved to the offices of Foster Care Resource Network at Children's Administration's direction in early October 2011. Other services provided included counseling for Charlie and Braden and in-home services to the maternal grandparents to support the children's placement.

Although the child protective services investigation resulted in an *unfounded* finding for child neglect,⁷ Mr. Powell agreed to the entry of an order establishing a dependency over both his children in October 2011. During the course of the dependency Mr. Powell established a new residence separate from his father's home and requested visits with his children be moved from the community based facility (Foster Care Resource Network) to his new home. When considering Mr. Powell's request, Children's Administration noted the impact visitation was having on other families at Foster Care Resource Network due to the high profile nature of the Powell case.⁸ Children's Administration considered maintaining visits in the more restrictive community setting (Foster Care Resource Network) or moving them to a more private, less restrictive setting such as Mr. Powell's home. The Child Fatality Review Committee received information from the visitation supervisor and others indicating that Mr. Powell's visits with his children were well structured (included snacks and activities), interactions were positive and included appropriate limit setting, affection, and attention to both children. After consulting with the children's Guardian Ad Litem and the psychologist conducting Mr. Powell's court ordered psychological evaluation, Children's Administration approved moving visits from Foster Care Resource Network's community based resource center to Mr. Powell's new home in November 2011. Children's Administration confirmed with all parties that visits would continue to be supervised but occur on Sundays in Mr. Powell's new home.

⁷ *Unfounded* finding is defined as follows: The determination following an investigation by child protective services that based on the available information it is more likely than not that child abuse or neglect did not occur or there is insufficient evidence for the department to determine whether the alleged child abuse or neglect did or did not occur. In this case there was insufficient evidence to support a finding that, more likely than not, Mr. Powell exposed his children to child pornography.

⁸ Other families visiting at the community center recognized Mr. Powell and his children while visiting. Concerns regarding possible distractions due to the notoriety of the family during family visitation for both Mr. Powell and the other families was considered.

The Revised Code of Washington (13.34.136) and Children's Administration Practice and Procedures⁹ support family visitation in the least restrictive environment and the Department views this as providing visitation in the family home, absent any safety concerns.

During the course of the case Mr. Powell requested an additional weekly visit with his children and identified a family friend who was willing to provide the supervision in the friend's home. Again, Children's Administration staffed this request with the children's Guardian Ad Litem, the Foster Care Resource Network visitation supervisor, and the psychologist completing Mr. Powell's psychological evaluation. After receiving approved background clearances on the identified family friends, and based on observations of Mr. Powell's parenting and interactions with his children during the Sunday visits, an additional weekly visit was approved by the court and began in early December 2011.

In January 2012, Mr. Powell's attorney filed a motion in the dependency action asking the court to require Children's Administration to place the children in Mr. Powell's home or, alternatively, to move the children out of the maternal grandparents' home. A hearing on the motion was scheduled for early February 2012. Prior to the hearing the West Valley City Police Department in West Valley City, Utah provided Children's Administration with confidential information (digital computer images) they had obtained during the search of Mr. Powell's home in August 2011. A Utah court order restricted access to the images.¹⁰ One of the individuals who were permitted to view the images was the psychologist completing Mr. Powell's psychological evaluation. Based on the psychologist's amended evaluation after reviewing the computer images, the juvenile court judge denied Mr. Powell's motion during a court hearing on February 1, 2012. The judge ordered the children to remain in relative foster care with the maternal grandparents and ordered Mr. Powell to participate in a psycho-sexual evaluation. Four days later, on February 5, 2012, during a supervised visit in his home, Mr. Powell set his home on fire killing himself and his sons.

Committee Discussion

A case chronology along with the complete case file relating to the family was prepared and provided to the Child Fatality Review Committee. Additional information provided to the Committee is noted in Appendix A of this report. Committee members also interviewed Children's Administration social workers assigned to the case, Children's Administration Intake supervisor, the contracted visitation supervisor, the Assistant Attorney General assigned to the case, and Pierce County Sheriff's Office detectives. The Committee discussed issues related to the assessment of child safety and Children's Administration practice and procedures, including decisions related to parent-child visitation, out-of-home placement, domestic violence, and collaboration and information sharing among investigative agencies.

⁹ Revised Code of Washington 13.34.136 (2) (b) (ii) Permanency Plan of Care and Children's Administration Practice and Procedures Section 4252 (C) (1)

¹⁰ An order from the Third Judicial District Court in Salt Lake County, Utah dated January 12, 2012 specifically identified the persons (8) permitted to view the information. The 8 persons permitted to view the images under the supervision of the Pierce County Sheriff's office were: the assigned Pierce County Sheriff detective, Assistant Attorney General representing Children's Administration in the dependency action, the attorney for the maternal grandparents, Mr. Powell's attorney, the children's Guardian Ad Litem, the juvenile court judge overseeing the dependency process, Children's Administration's assigned social worker, and the psychologist conducting Mr. Powell's psychological evaluation.

The Committee commented on the thoroughness of the work in this case, which included diligence in ensuring consultation and collaboration with partner agencies (law enforcement), Guardian Ad Litem and providers, documentation of case activity and progress, and consistent contact with Mr. Powell, the children and their relative care providers. The Committee stated all parties acknowledged child safety takes precedence and that efforts were made to share information to the extent possible to ensure child safety, while not compromising respective criminal investigations.

The Committee learned that in January 2010 Mr. Powell moved to Washington from Utah shortly after the reported disappearance of his wife in December 2009. At the time of Mr. Powell's relocation, Utah law enforcement officials considered Mr. Powell a person of interest in his wife's disappearance and a criminal investigation in Utah remained open. In August 2011 Utah law enforcement authorities, in collaboration with Pierce County law enforcement authorities, executed a search warrant on the home where Mr. Powell was living with his two sons. The search warrant was related to the criminal investigation by Utah authorities into Susan Powell's disappearance. Information obtained in this search resulted in the arrest of Mr. Powell's father and the subsequent out-of-home placement of Charlie and Braden (September 2011).

The Committee acknowledged the complexity of this case and the involvement of two law enforcement agencies¹¹ from two different jurisdictions made communication and information sharing with Children's Administration challenging, given the different investigation interests of the involved agencies. Law enforcement officers investigating Susan Powell's disappearance did have ongoing communication with social workers in this case, and officers told social workers that they believed Mr. Powell had killed his wife. However, the communication generally consisted of law enforcement expressing an opinion as to Mr. Powell's involvement in Susan Powell's disappearance. The Committee learned the law enforcement evidence gathered related to Susan Powell's disappearance would have raised specific safety concerns for the children, but that information was not made available to Children's Administration prior to the children's death.

The Committee noted information raising child safety concerns was part of a search warrant that was issued by a Pierce County Superior Court and sealed at the request of Utah law enforcement officers due to their ongoing criminal investigation in Utah regarding the disappearance and possible murder of Susan Powell. The Committee discussed whether the information in the sealed warrant could have been used by Children's Administration when conducting ongoing assessments of safety for the children, and to provide additional support for services required of the father in the dependency proceedings. Information that law enforcement in Utah had, which was unavailable to Children's Administration, could have been used in assessing the need for services and the structure of any contact between Mr. Powell and his children (e.g. duration of contact, location and supervision needs).

¹¹ The two police agencies were West Valley City Police Department in West Valley City, Utah and Pierce County Sheriff's Office, Pierce County, Washington.

The Committee also acknowledged that discovery¹² in dependency matters can pose additional challenges to information sharing between law enforcement agencies and Children's Administration as it requires all information available and used by Children's Administration to establish dependency be provided to parents and their attorneys. The Committee recognized the disclosure of criminal investigation information for the purposes of dependency proceedings could compromise an ongoing law enforcement investigation.

Another area of discussion by the Committee was Children's Administration's screening for domestic violence and whether further assessment for domestic violence should have occurred in this case. In February 2010, a Social Worker's Practice Guide to Domestic Violence was distributed to all Children's Administration social workers. The Practice Guide recommends screening for domestic violence at intake, and throughout the life of each case, and completing a specialized domestic violence assessment when domestic violence is identified. Children's Administration policy requires the intake worker to answer a universal screening question: "Has anyone used or threatened to use physical force against an adult in the home?" If the answer to this question is "yes," there are three additional questions that must be answered related to domestic violence. Further assessment is recommended to gather information from available sources to identify any safety threats to the children related to domestic violence and support decisions regarding child safety. Other assessment tools used by social workers throughout the life of a case also incorporate questions related to domestic violence. In the intakes received regarding the Powell family, the intake workers answered "no" to the universal domestic violence screening questions.

After much discussion, the Committee agreed that there was sufficient information provided by investigators regarding the disappearance of Susan Powell that social workers could have answered "yes" to the universal domestic violence screening question, which would have prompted further inquiry into issues related to domestic violence in the Powell family, in spite of the lack of any prior police reports alleging domestic violence in Utah or Washington. The Committee acknowledged information in the sealed warrant received after the children's death provided greater detail about the disappearance of Susan Powell but that information was unavailable to Children's Administration at the time decisions were being made.¹³

The Committee also discussed Children's Administration's actions and service delivery regarding the dependency case. At the September 2011 shelter care hearing the juvenile court judge ordered the following: Charlie and Braden to be placed in Children's Administration custody and in relative foster care placement with their maternal relatives; Mr. Powell to participate in a psychological evaluation; counseling for both children; and weekly supervised visitation between the children and their father. The Committee discussed that despite Mr. Powell's objection to the relative placement he was actively involved in the case plan and participated in all court-ordered services. Mr. Powell participated in the psychological evaluation and was well-prepared for visits with his children. Case documentation indicated he was actively involved with his children during visits and demonstrated appropriate parenting. Children's Administration approved moving supervised visits to Mr. Powell's home in

¹² Discovery in dependency cases affords all parties with the opportunity review all information used to establish dependency.

¹³ Information contained in the sealed search warrant became available in April 2012, after the children's death, when the court ordered the warrant unsealed in the separate criminal case involving the children's paternal grandfather.

November 2011 and increasing the frequency of visits in December 2011 based on observations of Mr. Powell with his children and of Mr. Powell's home. Law enforcement officers involved in the criminal investigation of Mr. Powell told the Committee that they were not aware that supervised visits were moved to his home. The detectives stated they would have had concerns about visits in his home; however they consider decisions regarding visitation up to Children's Administration and the court.

Law enforcement officials from Utah and Washington maintained contact with Children's Administration throughout the dependency matter as a means to support child safety. In November 2011 when Utah detectives contacted Children's Administration and were told Mr. Powell intended to request his children be returned to his care, the Utah detective stated they had information that could help support continued out-of-home placement. Utah officials stated they would request court permission to release the information to Children's Administration.¹⁴ In early January 2012, Mr. Powell's attorney filed a motion requesting the children be returned to his care or in the event the children were not returned home that they be placed in an alternative out-of-home placement.¹⁵ Consequently, Utah law enforcement officials requested a court order to allow the release of some information (computer images) obtained during the August 2011 search of the Powell home. A court order dated January 12, 2012, from the Third District Court, Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City, Utah was provided to a Pierce County Sheriff's detective by Utah law enforcement officials. The order specifically identified eight (8) individuals who could view the images, required that the viewing occur under the supervision of Washington State law enforcement officials (Pierce County Sheriff's Department), and prohibited sharing the images with any person not specifically listed in the order.

The images found on Joshua Powell's computer included animated images depicting inappropriate behavior between adults, children and well known cartoon characters. The juvenile court judge and the psychologist conducting Mr. Powell's psychological evaluation were permitted by the court order to view the images prior to the court hearing on Mr. Powell's motion asking that the children be placed in his care.

The Committee learned that on February 1, 2012, after having reviewed the computer images provided by Utah law enforcement and the addendum to Mr. Powell's psychological evaluation,¹⁶ the judge denied Mr. Powell's motion and ordered that the children remain in their relative placement and further ordered that Mr. Powell undergo a psycho-sexual evaluation that would include a polygraph examination. The Committee discussed the impact the judge's ruling and the intrusiveness the type of evaluation ordered may have on a parent. The Committee discussed the possibility of reassessing a parent's emotional stability when a judge rules against a motion for return of their children and orders additional services, particularly a service as intrusive as a psycho-sexual evaluation. This assessment could include whether any changes in parent/child contact are necessary for child safety.

¹⁴ Utah officials stated they would need a court order allowing the release of the information before sharing it with Children's Administration.

¹⁵ Mr. Powell had identified an alternative placement for the children who had completed background checks required by Children's Administration.

¹⁶ The evaluation recommended continued out of home placement for the children and for Mr. Powell to undergo a psycho-sexual evaluation.

Committee Findings and Recommendations

The Committee made the following findings and recommendations based on the interviews with Children's Administration social workers, visitation provider, Assistant Attorney General, and law enforcement officials, review of the case record, Children's Administration Practice and Procedures, the Revised Code of Washington, and the Washington Administrative Code.

While the Committee made recommendations to improve practice based on review of this case, the Committee did not draw conclusions about whether any actions by Children's Administration, law enforcement, or the court could have prevented Mr. Powell's actions.

Committee Findings

1. The Committee noted that at the onset of this case, Children's Administration accounted for the high profile nature of the case (due to the national attention and publicity) and its complexity (due to involvement of multiple investigative agencies and jurisdictions). Given the Committee's collective experience being involved in or reviewing thousands of child welfare cases, the Committee found the work in this case was consistent with and sometimes exceeded accepted standards for child welfare practice and procedures regarding case decisions and actions with the exception noted in Finding 2. The conduct and interaction of professionals involved in this case demonstrated the highest concern for the children's health, safety and welfare.
2. Children's Administration policy requires universal screening for domestic violence at intake and throughout the life of each case. The Committee found that information available to social workers regarding the disappearance of Susan Powell was sufficient to prompt additional questions to gather more information about the existence of domestic violence, if any, in this family and any related safety threats to the children. The Social Workers' Practice Guide to Domestic Violence provides information including legal considerations and best practices for gathering information about domestic violence and applying that information to case decisions. Distribution of the practice guide was not augmented with in-person or on-line training curricula to support use of the guide. Although the professionals involved in this case demonstrated the highest concern for the children's health, safety, and welfare, the lack of training on best practices regarding domestic violence in addition to the complexity of the jurisdictional issues between Utah and Washington mentioned in this report may have contributed to the lack of further exploration of domestic violence in this case.
3. In regard to decisions referencing visitation in this case, the Committee found that, although not required, Children's Administration did not consult with law enforcement officials on the decision to move supervised visits to Mr. Powell's home. The Committee noted that when there is an open criminal investigation regarding a parent involved in a dependency action, consultation between law enforcement and Children's Administration about parent/child contact or visits may be beneficial. Consultation with law enforcement could result in obtaining information that might affect decisions about changes in visitation such as duration, location and need for supervision.

4. The Committee found that after completing an overview of the case that included a review of all court transcripts the Committee was unable to locate information articulating the judge's reasons as to why Mr. Powell's objection to relative placement was overruled by the judge.¹⁷

Committee Recommendations

1. In dependency proceedings when there is an active criminal investigation Children's Administration should make concerted efforts to include and consult with the assigned detective prior to making changes in parent/child contact, e.g. visitation in accordance with the respective county protocols required by RCW 26.44.185.¹⁸
2. Given the intrusive nature of a psycho-sexual evaluation, Children's Administration should reassess parent/child contact (e.g. visitation duration, supervision, location) prior to the next parent-child visit when a judge orders a parent undergo such psycho-sexual evaluation in the course of a dependency proceeding.
3. Because the identification of domestic violence is critical when making case decisions intended to increase safety for children, on-going training and regular consultation on domestic violence for Children's Administration staff is recommended. Training should address how to use the Children's Administration's Social Worker's Practice Guide to Domestic Violence and assessing safety threats to children.
4. In cases where the judge orders a child's placement with a specific caregiver over the objection of a parent, the Committee recommended the reasons be articulated in the court record.

¹⁷ Revised Code of Washington 13.34.260 Foster Home Placement - Parental Preferences.

¹⁸ Revised Code of Washington 26.44.185 Revision and Expansion of Protocols

Appendix A

Resources Made Available During Review

1. Case File Information
 - a. Complete hard copy of case file
 - b. Redacted electronic case file – made available on line
2. Pierce County Superior Court Transcripts
 - a. September 27, 2011 Shelter Care Hearing
 - b. September 28, 2011 Shelter Care Hearing
 - c. October 26, 2011 Fact Finding Hearing
 - d. February 1, 2012 Placement Hearing
3. Washington State Statutes (Revised Code of Washington and Washington Administrative Code)
 - a. RCW 13.34. Juvenile Court Act
 - i. 13.34.060 Shelter Care – Placement – Custody – Duties of parties
 - ii. 13.34.130 (1) (b) (ii) (B) – Order for Disposition for a Dependent Child
 - iii. 13.34.136 Permanency Plan of Care
 - iv. 13.34.260 Foster Home Placement – Parental Preferences
 - b. RCW 13.50 Keeping and Release of Records by Juvenile Justice or Care Agencies
 - i. 13.50.010 Definitions – Condition When Filing Petition or Information – Duties to Maintain Accurate Records and Access
 - ii. 13.50.100 Records Not Relating to Commission of Juvenile Offenses – Maintenance and Access
 - c. RCW 26.44 Abuse of Children
 - i. 26.44.030 Reports – Duty and Authority
 - ii. 26.44.185 Revision and Expansion of Protocols
 - d. RCW 74.13 Duties of the department – Child welfare and day care advisory Committee
 - i. 74.13.031 Duties of the Department – Child Welfare
 - e. RCW 74.14 Children and Family Services
 - i. 74.14A.020 Services for Children
 - f. WAC 388-15-009 What is Child Abuse or Neglect?
 - g. Washington Courts Rule GR 15 – Destruction, Sealing and Redaction of Court Records
4. Children’s Administration Practice and Procedures Guide
 - a. Chapter 2000 Child Protective Services
 - i. Section 2200 Intake
 - ii. Section 2220 Guidelines
 - b. Chapter 2500 Service Delivery
 - i. Section 2541 Structured Decision Making®
 - c. Chapter 4200 Child Welfare Services Assessment
 - i. Section 4254 Parent Child Sibling Visitation Policy
 - ii. Section 4261 Placement Priorities
5. Children’s Administration Case Services Manual

- a. Chapter 4400 Out of Home Case Planning
 - i. Section 4422 Most Family – Like Setting
 - ii. Section 4423 Relative Placement, Parental Preference, Relative Search, Relative Notification and Documentation
- 6. Children’s Administration Structured Decision Making® (Risk Assessment) Procedures Manual
- 7. Children’s Administration Visitation Contract Information
- 8. Children’s Administration Social Worker’s Practice Guide to Domestic Violence, February 2010
- 9. Washington State Institute for Public Policy Report – Outcomes of Referrals to Child Protective Services: Comparing Reporters, June 2009
- 10. Office of the Family and Children’s Ombudsman – Patterns in Mandated Reporter Referrals 2006-2008, July 2009
- 11. County Child Sexual Abuse, Physical Abuse and Fatality Investigation Protocols – Pierce County, June 2010
- 12. Training PowerPoint provided by Washington’s Assistant Attorney General’s Office (Children’s Administration)- Child Protective Services Investigative Training – Legal Framework